



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,062	03/22/2007	Seung June Song	4466-0103PUS1	9642
2252	7590	12/24/2009		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH				EXAMINER
PO BOX 747				HSU, RYAN
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/24/2009	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/562,062  <b>Examiner</b> RYAN HSU	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SONG, SEUNG JUNE  <b>Art Unit</b> 3714
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**

THE REPLY FILED 23 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-23 and 25-33.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*/John M Hotaling II/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714*

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's representative argues that the prior art of record fails to disclose "increasing the level of a winner by one and transferring a certain rate of credit from a loser to the winner, eliminating the loser from the tournament and matching winners having the same level and credits". Examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art of Walker teaches a tournament which progresses by eliminating members that have not reached a certain level in the score. The "winners" progress in the tournament thereby increasing their involvement into the next level of play (ie: an increase in the level by one" and the "losers" are eliminated from the tournament". The money that was used to initially enter into the tournament is then passed on to the general pot which by the nature of the tournament will pass to the winner's pot. Thus the credit is given to the potential winnings of the winners and they are always playing opponents of the same level (ie: players that have reached a score or level in the tournament". In this situation the levels of the competitors and credits are different from one another but are within the same threshold as allowed by the progression of the tournament. This can be made analogous to the elimination of Texas Hold 'em where players that move forward bring along winnings received from losers and are eliminated and the remaining players have all progressed because they are above a threshold (ie: more than zero). In the cited example of Texas Hold 'em with each round of play those players that are not eliminated possess the same status of level and credits and is an inherent attribute in the arts. These qualifications are well known in the tournament arts and it is under this basis that the claims in how the prior art has been applied. Furthermore, the applicant's representative states that the prior art fails to match the same level players and an opponent on the same level. As shown in the arguments above, the instant claims are met by the currently presented prior art. It is recommended that the applicant's representative discuss and elaborate in the claim language what exactly is used to distinguish the use of level by the prior art of record and the instant invention and make the necessary amendments to present that view in future amendments.